



City Clerk Council and Public Services <clerk.cps@lacity.org>

RE: Council Meeting 9/28. Item #5. CF 20-1536

1 message

Barbara Broide <bbroide@hotmail.com>

Tue, Sep 27, 2022 at 4:58 PM

To: "mandy.morales@lacity.org" <mandy.morales@lacity.org>

Cc: City Clerk Council and Public Services <clerk.cps@lacity.org>, "councilmember.martinez@lacity.org" <councilmember.martinez@lacity.org>, Eric Bruins <eric.bruins@lacity.org>, "justin orenstein - CD 5 (STAP)" <justin.orenstein@lacity.org>

I phoned the City Clerk's office to report problems with the manner in which Item #5 is posted for tomorrow's Council meeting. I was referred to you by the City Clerk's office as you are said to be the Legislative Assistant working on this meeting and/or agenda item.

It is WRONG to list neighborhood councils as being in favor of something when those who submitted motions did not pass motions in favor of what is currently being considered and voted upon.

Consideration of this item should not proceed as scheduled.

Those neighborhood councils listed in favor voted in support of the original council motion seeking additional information for the Council from Public Works/StreetsLA pertaining to the proposed STAP program. It had nothing to do with the LAMC - an LAMC that was not introduced until the STAP MND was released. (And it should be noted that many of the items raised in the original Council motion were never reported back to the Council as requested in the motion.)

There are additional related policy issues that the Council should consider before voting on this item, but it will be up to them as to whether or not to do their full due diligence before taking action.

I believe that the item on the Sept. 28 agenda should be rescheduled and the posting of NCs supporting and opposing corrected. There are many additional NCs opposed to the new LAMC who submitted comments to Council File 20-1536-S2. Those should be added to the list of those opposing this measure.

The very title of the Council File has nothing to do with the item now to be voted upon: Sidewalk and Transit Amenities Program (STAP) / Public Engagement / Request for Proposals

It has nothing to do with STAP (as STAP does not / did not need a new LAMC to proceed) and has nothing to do with Public Engagement or the RFP.

What can be done to correct these problems?

Barbara Broide
Coalition for a Scenic Los Angeles